REMARKS

Claims 1-36 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Henson (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,383.) Independent claims 1 and 18 are amended for clarity. New claim 37-39 are added. Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance for several reasons. For example, Henson does not disclose user profiles that are uniquely associated with a user. Claims 1 and 18 recite this limitation. Also, claims 1 and 18 recite that a characteristic in the user profile should be updated based on a response by the user. (See claims 1 and 18 for full text.) Henson does not update any type of user profile based on responses from a user. Both of these reasons for allowability are discussed below.

1. Henson does not disclose user profiles that are uniquely associated with a user.

Claim 1, for example, is amended to clarify that the user profile is uniquely associated with a user:

said identification identifying a user profile that is uniquely associated with said user, the user profile including at least one characteristic corresponding to said user

Henson does not teach or suggest using profiles that are uniquely associated with a particular user. Instead, Henson teaches that individual users are matched to a "customer set." Stated differently, Henson discloses that many users are associated with a single customer set and that no single user is associated with a unique profile.

For example, Henson teaches that a user can be matched to an appropriate customer set such as "federal government employee." (column 14, lines 18-21). And once the user is matched to the proper set, the online store operates based on that prescribed customer set.

(column 13, lines 30-51). For example, when a federal employee accesses the Dell Web site, the

Henson device could show merchandise specifically priced or offered to federal government employees. Henson would not use unique user profiles in determining which merchandise to show.

Because Henson does not disclose a user profile that is uniquely associated with a user, applicants submit that claim 1 and the corresponding dependent claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicants also submit that claim 18, which includes similar language, is now in condition for allowance.

2. Henson does not update any type of user profile based on responses from a user.

Claims 1 and 18 are also allowable because Henson does not update a user profile based on responses from the user. Claim 1, for example, requires:

updating, based on a response to said formatted display;

- (1) the at least one characteristic in said user profile; and
- (2) a component associated with said base product when said response includes a selection of an option from a different set of options associated with said component.

Instead of updating a characteristic in a user profile based on a response to a formatted display, Henson selects a new screen or new product option based on user input. Figure 4 of Henson demonstrates this process. But displaying a new screen or product option does not equate to updating a characteristic in a user profile as is recited in claim 1. In fact, Henson does not update an characteristics in either a user profile, which Henson does not even include, or in the customer set based on user responses. (column 13, lines 30-61).

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 and claim 18, both of which include an updating limitation, are allowable over the cited art. And applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims and any corresponding dependent claims.

Attorney Docket No. FINL-009/00US Serial No. 09/518,916

Page 12

3. New claim 37-39 contain allowable subject matter.

New claims 37 through 39 are added, and they recite independently allowable subject

matter. For example, claim 38 recites:

wherein the at least one characteristic in said user profile comprises an

indicator that indicates the number of times that the user requested

automated assistance.

First, Henson does not maintain a user profile as required by the claims. Second, Henson

does not disclose an indicator that indicates the number of times that a user requested automated

assistance. As Henson's Figure 4 shows, Henson merely responds to a user's inquiry and does

not keep track of how many times a user asks questions. Accordingly, Applicants submit that

Henson does not teach or suggest the limitation of claim 38.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that no further impediments

exist to the allowance of this application and, therefore, solicit an indication of allowability.

However, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned if any question or comments arise.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R.

By:

§§1.16, 1.17, and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to

Deposit Account No. 50-1283.

COOLEY GODWARD LLP

Attention: Patent Group

One Freedom Square - Reston Town Center

11951 Freedom Drive

Reston, Virginia 20190-5601

Tel: (720) 566-4125

Fax: (720) 566-4099

Respectfully submitted,

COOLEY GODWARD LLP

Wayne O. Stacy

Reg. No. 45,125

12